



**HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION  
HEARING SYNOPSIS**

**WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2004**

**Tour**  
**Del Monte Plant #3**  
**801 Auzeville Avenue**  
**San Jose, CA**  
**3:30 to 4:30 p.m.**

**TOUR CANCELLED**

**Regular Session**  
**6:00 P.M.**  
**City Hall, Room 205**  
**801 North First Street**  
**San Jose, CA**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS**

**STEPHEN POLCYN, CHAIR**  
**MICHAEL YOUMANS, VICE CHAIR**  
**SANDRA PAIM                      JUSTINE LEONG**  
**EDWARD JANKE                MARTIN ALKIRE**  
**PATRICIA COLOMBE**

**STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTOR**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, BUILDING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT**

## NOTE

To arrange an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act to participate in this public meeting, we ask that you call (408) 277-4576 (VOICE) or (408) 998-5299 (TTY) at least two business days before the meeting.

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

Good evening, my name is **Stephen Polcyn**, and I am the Chair of the Historic Landmarks Commission. On behalf of the Commission, I would like to welcome you to tonight's meeting. I will now call to order the **December 1, 2004** meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission. Please remember to turn off your cell phones and pagers.

If you want to address the Commission, **fill out a speaker card (located at the technician's station), and give the completed card to the technician. Please include the agenda item number for reference.**

### **The procedure for public hearings is as follows:**

- After the staff report, applicants may make a five-minute presentation.
- Anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposal should prepare to come forward. Each speaker will have two minutes.
- After the proponents speak, anyone wishing to speak in opposition should prepare to come forward. Each speaker will have two minutes.
- Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
- The Commission will then close the public hearing. The Historic Landmarks Commission will take action on the item.

### **The procedure for referrals is as follows:**

- Anyone wishing to speak on a referral will be limited to one minute.
- Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
- The Historic Landmarks Commission will comment on the referral item.

**If a Commissioner would like a topic to be addressed under one of the Good and Welfare items, please contact Planning staff in advance of the Commission meeting.**

An agenda and a copy of all staff reports have been placed on the table for your convenience.

## SYNOPSIS

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

#### 6:00 PM SESSION

#### 1. ROLL CALL

All Present

#### 2. DEFERRALS

Any item scheduled for hearing this evening for which deferral is being requested will be taken out of order to be heard first on the matter of deferral. **A list of staff-recommended deferrals is available on the table.** If you want to change any of the deferral dates recommended or speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should say so at this time.

The matter of deferrals is now closed.

#### 3. CONSENT CALENDAR

##### NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

The consent calendar items are considered to be routine and will be adopted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a request is made by a member of the Historic Landmarks Commission, staff or the public to have an item removed from the consent calendar and considered separately. If anyone in the audience wishes to speak on one of these items, please make your request at this time.

- a. [APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2004, HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION SYNOPSIS.](#)

The Consent Calendar is now closed.

Approved As Corrected. 7-0-0

#### 4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a. [CA04-001. Conservation Area designation](#) for a portion of the Market-Almaden SNI Planning Area on a 10.5 gross-acre site, generally bounded by rear of properties on Balbach Street to the north, rear of properties on South Market Street to the east,

Highway 280 to the south, and Almaden Avenue to the west. (Multiple Owners).  
Council District 3. SNI: Market-Almaden. CEQA: Exempt. Deferred from 11-3-04.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Planning staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Commission recommend that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the designation of the subject area as the Market-Almaden Conservation Area

**Commissioner Youmans commented that public and private projects have been slowly chipping away at the Market Almaden Neighborhood and questioned whether the Conservation Area nomination was brought forward to rectify problems created by these projects. Staff responded that, while development has encroached upon the edges of the Market-Almaden neighborhood, the City has worked with the neighborhood to preserve and enhance what remains. These efforts are apparent through the City initiated Market-Almaden Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI) Plan process and the City Council approval of the Market Almaden Improvement Plan in March 2003. Furthermore, the Council approved Market Almaden SNI Neighborhood Improvement Plan includes priority actions and recommendations that the City and the Redevelopment Agency are working collaboratively with the Market Almaden community to implement.**

**Staff noted that the impetus for the proposed Conservation Area is the Market Almaden SNI Plan's Top Ten Priority Action Number 4, "Explore the Establishment of the Market Almaden Area as a Conservation Area."**

**Chair Polcyn asked how the interface with the Convention Center would be addressed and if the Convention Center was on board with the Conservation Area. Staff responded that the Market Almaden Plan includes design guidelines intended to guide adjacent new development, including the expansion of the Convention Center, to ensure that this development is compatible with and does not detract from the quality of life in the Market Almaden Neighborhood. Staff also noted that the Department of Convention, Arts and Entertainment participated in the development of the Market Almaden Neighborhood Improvement Plan and is aware of the proposed Conservation Area.**

**Staff Recommendation adopted, 7-0-0**

- b. [HP04-006. HISTORIC PRESERVATION PERMIT](#) to allow the rehabilitation of the Porter Stock Building (HL01-127) with office above first floor retail uses. The .22 acre site is located on the west side of North First Street, approximately 150 feet north

of San Fernando Street (83-91 North First Street)). Council District 3. SNI: None. CEQA: Exempt.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Planning staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Commission 1) find that the proposal to rehabilitate the Porter Stock Building (City Landmark No. HL01-127, 83-91 North First Street) conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards No. 1, 6, and 9, and 2) recommend approval of the proposed alterations to the Director of Planning with the condition that the final plan set specify cement plaster surrounds at the entry as well as standard conditions.

**The project architect, Bob Hightower, requested a change in the proposed plans for Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete (GFRC) column cover materials in place of the wood column covers indicated on the plan set for the storefront rehabilitation. Hightower also specified that the plaster surround at the new entry door would be smooth.**

**Commissioner Colombe noted that in order for the smaller signboard to be compatible it might be lighter in color, as indicated in the historic photograph.**

**Vice Chair Youmans noted that he was concerned about removing the existing iron pilaster from the north end of the façade, and asked whether there were primary sources documenting its origin.**

**Bob Hightower responded that he believed it was relocated or saved as part of the O'Neil Building remodel.**

**Commissioner Leong commended the applicant for a good job as did other commissioners. Commissioner Leong suggested that the transom windows be equally proportioned and distributed.**

**Chair Polcyn opened the meeting for public comment.**

**Judi Henderson of PAC SJ said that the rehabilitation is exciting, but that the iron pilasters are dated with the construction date of the building and appear to be original.**

**Vice Chair Youmans stated that if the pilaster was part of the Porter Stock Building and was removed, then the project would not meet the Standards.**

**Chair Polcyn pointed out that the pilaster could be seen as an artifact, standing alone.**

Commissioner Janke voiced concerns regarding the historicism of the façade proposal and echoed concerns regarding the removal of the iron pilaster.

Commissioner Paim suggested that if the pilaster has been relocated, perhaps it could be salvaged and documented.

Chair Polcyn recommended further investigation of the pilaster and if it is found to be original, reexamine the proposal to include the pilaster.

Bob Hightower voiced concern regarding retention of the one pilaster and a resulting asymmetrical façade.

Commissioner Colombe asked whether the pilaster could be left in place and the new entry moved to the south. Bob Hightower responded that the pilaster would most likely have to be removed and replaced to save due to significant structural work required behind the façade.

Commissioner Colombe noted that the pilaster could have gained significance over time if it has been on the building for close to 50 years. If it turns out the pilaster was relocated recently when the O’Neil Building was remodeled, then it would not be an issue.

Commissioner Alkire asked whether the inclusion of both pilasters into the rehabilitated façade had been considered.

Courtney Damkroger noted that staff and the DRC had determined that it would not be historically accurate to relocate the second pilaster from the north of the O’Neil Building onto the Porter Stock façade without documentation supporting this as the original location.

Staff recommendation adopted with the following additional conditions, 7-0-0:

1. GFRC material should be approved for the column covers
2. The transom windows shall be uniformly spaced
3. Further investigation should be conducted to determine whether the iron pilaster is part of the historic fabric of the Porter Stock Building and if so the pilaster should be retained in-place.

## **5. REFERRALS FROM CITY COUNCIL, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS OR OTHER AGENCIES**

- a. [PCD04-096 Conforming Planned Development Rezoning](#) from A(PD) Planned Development to A(PD) Planned Development to allow 265 single-family attached residences on a 4.2 gross-acre site. The subject site is currently within an A(PD)

Planned Development Zoning District (PDC98-027) that encompasses an approximately 10-acre site generally bounded by The Alameda to the north, Bush Street to the west, the now-vacated White Street & active railroad tracks to the east, and Laurel Grove Lane to the south. Council District 6. SNI: None. CEQA: Cahill Station Residential Redevelopment Project EIR, Resolution No. 69355.

**Devin Hassett of Centex Homes presented the project.**

**Judi Henderson, PAC SJ noted that while the project is not developed enough to conceptualize at this point, it had been a long, hard battle to get the previous developer to keep the building up. The change should be supported if it will result in less degradation to the building.**

**Commissioners commended the developer for a wonderful example of historic re-use, and stated their interest in touring the building.**

- b. **[DISCUSSION AND COMMENT REGARDING THE Draft Environmental Impact Report for the KB Home Monte Vista Residential Planned Development Zoning Project](#)** (File No. 03-071). The proposed rezoning would allow the construction of up to 390 residential units on 11.1 acres north of Auzerai Avenue, and the conveyance of approximately 2.2 acres south of Auzerai Avenue along the west side of Los Gatos Creek to the City of San José for use as a park. The project is located north of Auzerai Avenue, between Sunol Street and Los Gatos Creek in San Jose, Council District 6.

**Commissioners stated that the mitigation measures are insufficient given the significance of the historic complex.**

**The Commission indicated the City policies that promote the preservation of historic resources and are referenced in the DEIR. The proposed project is contrary to these City policies.**

**The Commission drew attention to the Project Objectives on Page 9 of the DEIR, and, in particular, the City's objectives which call for consistency with the San Jose 2020 General Plan and furthering of the General Plan goals and strategies. Preservation of the City's historic resources is a common theme among these goals and strategies.**

**Commissioners stated that the Del Monte Plant #3 is of such historic significance to the City of San Jose that adaptive use of the significant portions of the site should be paramount to any development of the site. Mariani Square was referred to as a prime example of successful adaptive use. Commissioners recognized the rare architectural significance of the Streamline Moderne buildings as well as the social significance of the site, stating that cannery history is fundamental to the City's history.**

**Commissioners complimented the quality of the Reuse Study, Appendix H of the DEIR. Commissioners stated that there appear to be several feasible alternatives that retain significant portions of the complex while providing for substantial new construction. Commissioners felt that high-rise development at this location, given nearby development and the adjacency to the Vasona Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT), was an excellent solution.**

**Commissioners stated that the project should be evaluated using all available economic incentives for historic preservation including the transfer of development rights and the various tax credit programs. The Commission felt that in spite of comments in the EIR that if this project does not go forward a similar one is likely to follow, it is entirely possible that an application may come forward to reuse the historic portion of the complex and take advantage of the historic nature of the site and the available incentives.**

**Commissioners asked whether an economic feasibility study would be forthcoming from the developer.**

**It was suggested that the conveyor belt across Auzerais Avenue be retained as it is a well-recognized icon of the site and the canning industry in San Jose. The conveyor belt could be included with or as a public art component for the site.**

**Commissioners suggested that the development of the adjacent park incorporate information, equipment, and structures from the historic complex. Examples from other cities of such parks, include Seattle's Gasworks Park as well as parks in New York City.**

**A motion was made to authorize Chair Polcyn to work with staff to draft and sign a DEIR comment letter on behalf of the Commission. Approved 7-0-0**

## **6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Public comments to the Historic Landmarks Commission on nonagendized items. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to two minutes. The Commission cannot take any formal action without the item being properly noticed and placed on an agenda. In response to public comment, the Historic Landmarks Commission is limited to the following options:

1. Responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
  2. Requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
  3. Directing staff to place the item on a future agenda.
- a. Public Comment



**Judi Henderson, PAC SJ asked to bring the house located on Mitzi Drive in Council District One to the Commissioners' attention. It may be Sylvester Graves' home circa 1868, which PAC SJ believes is scheduled for development.**

**Franklin Maggi stated that the Graves house will be included in an upcoming book on Bay Area Architecture. Mr. Maggi also noted that the iron pilaster referenced earlier this evening in item 4.b is located on a party wall between the Porter Stock Building and the O'Neil Building.**

## **7. GOOD AND WELFARE**

### **a. Report from the Redevelopment Agency**

- Verbal update on the following two projects: Crescent Jewelers at 87 - 99 S. First Street and Dr. Eu buildings at 35 – 39 E. Santa Clara Street  
**The Agency is in negotiations with the owners of the Crescent Jewelers Building, and has only received site plans. No other plans have been proposed as yet.**

**Work on the Dr. EU Buildings has stopped due to funding issues. The Agency is looking into the issues.**

### **b. Report from the Secretary**

- None

### **c. Report from the Subcommittees**

- Design Review
  - [DRC 11-16-04 Synopsis Report](#)  
**Accepted. 3-0-0 Next Meeting: Wed. Dec. 15<sup>th</sup> 2004**
- History San Jose Collections Committee Liaison
  - [Report on History San José Actions on Outside Storage](#)  
**Vice Chair Youmans & Melissa Johnson. History San Jose reported**
- Coyote Valley Specific Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan Technical Advisory Committee  
**Commissioner Paim has reviewed documentation of Historic Resources and encourages Commissioners to view Coyote Valley historic resource information on line.**

**Coyote Valley DEIR scheduled for circulation in Spring 2005.**

**Next Meeting: Monday Dec. 13<sup>th</sup> 2004**

- **Dublin Sister City Program  
No Report**
- d. **Commissioner feedback on recently attended historic preservation training workshops  
Commissioners Alkire and Leong attended the San Francisco Landmarks  
Preservation Advisory Board workshop on the Secretary of the Interior's  
Standards. Consultant Nore Winter gave an overview of the Standards  
principles with examples in San Francisco. Copies of the handouts were  
distributed to the Commission and made available to the public.**

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Approved 7-0-0**

## 2004 -2005 HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

DATE	TIME	TYPE OF MEETING	LOCATION
December 15, 2004	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
January 19, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
February 2, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
February 16, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
March 2, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
March 16, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
April 6, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
April 20, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
April 22, 2005	12:00- 5:00 p.m.	Retreat	TBA
May 4, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
May 18, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
June 1, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
June 15, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
July 20, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
August 3, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
August 17, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
September 7, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
September 21, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
October 5, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
October 19, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
November 2, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
November 16, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400
December 7, 2005	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room 205
December 21, 2005	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Meeting	Room 400

HISTORIC LANDMARKS AGENDA ON THE WEB:

<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/hearings/index.htm>